UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

JONES DAY
222 EAST 41ST ST
NEW YORK NY 10017

MAILED

MAR 28 2011

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of :
Jenny E. Freeman et al. :
Application No. 10/753,871 : DECISION ON PETITION
Filed: January 09, 2004 :
Attorney Docket No. **8118.003.USDV** :

This is a decision on the petition under the unintentional provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b), filed August 31, 2010, to revive the above-identified application.

The petition is **GRANTED**.

The application became abandoned for failure to timely file a reply within the meaning of 37 CFR 1.113 to the final Office action of May 12, 2008. The proposed reply required for consideration of a petition to revive must be a Notice of Appeal (and appeal fee required by 37 CFR 41.20(b)(2), an amendment that *prima facie* places the application in condition for allowance, a Request for Continued Examination and submission (37 CFR 1.114), or the filing of a continuing application under 37 CFR 1.53(b). See MPEP 711.03(c)(III)(A)(2). No extensions of time pursuant to the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a) were obtained. Accordingly, the date of abandonment of this application is August 13, 2008.

The petition satisfies the requirements of 37 CFR 1.137(b) in that petitioner has supplied (1) the reply in the form of a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) and fee of $405, and the submission required by 37 CFR 1.114; (2) the petition fee of $810; and (3) a proper statement of unintentional delay. Accordingly, the reply to the final Office Action of May 12, 2008 is accepted as having been unintentionally delayed.

37 CFR 1.137(b)(3) requires a statement that "the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional." Since the statement appearing in the petition varies from the language required by 37 CFR 1.137(b)(3), the statement is being construed as the required statement. Petitioner must notify the Office if this is not a correct reading of the statement appearing in the petition.

The Power of Attorney submitted with the petition on August 31, 2010 is not accepted. The Power of Attorney was signed by Rick Lifsitz, acting on behalf of the assignee. However, the statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) included therewith is not acceptable. The instant application is a continuation-in-part of the parent application 09/389,342 ('342 application). The assignment recorded against the '342 application can not be applied to the instant application. See MPEP§ 306. Therefore, the Power of Attorney will not be accepted at this time.

It is not apparent whether the person signing the statement of unintentional delay was in a position to have firsthand or direct knowledge of the facts and circumstances of the delay at issue. Nevertheless, such statement is being treated as having been made as the result of a reasonable inquiry into the facts and circumstances of such delay. See 37 CFR 10.18(b) and Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure; Final Rule Notice, 62 Fed. Reg. 53131, 53178 (October 10, 1997), 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 63, 103 (October 21, 1997). In the event that such an inquiry has not been made, petitioner must make such an inquiry. If such inquiry results in the discovery that it is not correct that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional, petitioner must notify the Office.

Telephone inquiries concerning this decision should be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-2783.

This application is being referred to Technology Center AU 3737 for processing of the RCE and for appropriate action by the Examiner in the normal course of business on the amendment submitted in accordance with 37 CFR 1.114.

Ramesh Krishnamurthy
Petitions Examiner
Office of Petitions